

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Hansjoerg Meerpohl et al.
Application Number: 10/584,164
Filing Date: 04/09/2007
Group Art Unit: 3743
Examiner: Steven Michael Gravini
Title: METHOD AND DEVICE FOR DRYING CLOTHES

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.192, Appellants hereby file an appeal brief in the above-identified application. This Appeal Brief is accompanied by the requisite fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(f).

Table of Contents

(1)	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
(2)	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	3
(3)	STATUS OF CLAIMS	3
(4)	STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	3
(5)	SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	4
(6)	GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL	7
(7)	ARGUMENT	8
(8)	CONCLUSION.....	16
	CLAIMS APPENDIX	17
	EVIDENCE APPENDIX	22
	RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX.....	23

(1) REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is BSH Bosch und Siemens Hausgeräte GmbH.

(2) RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no appeals or interferences that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1 - 15 and 32 are cancelled. Claims 16 - 31 and 33 - 36 are pending in the present application and have been finally rejected. The final rejections of claims 16 - 31 and 33 - 36 are being appealed. Claims 16 and 28 are independent.

(4) STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

In response to the Final Rejection dated April 28, 2010, an Amendment was received in the US Patent Office on July 23, 2010. An Advisory Action mailed August 9, 2010 indicated that the request for reconsideration set forth in the Amendment received in the US Patent Office on July 23, 2010 had been considered but did not place the application in condition for allowance. A Notice of Appeal was received in the US Patent Office on August 12, 2010. No further amendments have been filed.

(5) SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent Claim 16

One aspect of the present invention, as defined by, for example, independent claim 16, relates to a method for drying laundry in a dryer comprising a housing and a drum receiving the laundry and mounted for rotation with respect to the housing. The method comprises the acts of performing a drying program including a heating-up phase, a drying phase, and a cooling-down phase (Page 2, lines 4 - 6, Page 3, lines 13 - 15, and Figure 1). The act of performing an anti-crease cycle includes performing an anti-crease cycle after the drying phase has been performed, the anti-crease cycle having alternating intervals including rotary movement time intervals, in which the drum is rotated to agitate the laundry, and stoppage time intervals, in which the drum stops rotating and the laundry is at rest (Page 3, lines 28 - 31 and Figure 1). According to independent claim 16, the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter (Page 2, lines 7 - 24 and Figure 1).

The present invention is directed to overcoming the problems that arise in known laundry drier operations in which a relatively prolonged anti-crease cycle disadvantageously results into further stress being imposed upon laundry in the laundry drier. The present invention also beneficially reduces the frequency at which the drive motor of the laundry drier and the switching elements are turned on and off.

Independent Claim 28

A further aspect of the present invention as defined by, for example, independent claim 28, is directed to a laundry dryer comprising a housing 1, a drum 2 receiving the laundry and mounted for rotation with respect to the housing 1, and a motor 9 coupled to the drum 2 for driving rotation of the drum 2 (Page 3, lines 11 - 15 and Figure 1). The laundry drier recited in independent claim 28 further comprises an inlet duct 5 providing an air flow to the drum 2 and a heating device 6 for selectively heating air in the inlet

duct 5 (Page 3, lines 11 - 15 and Figure 1). Additionally, the laundry drier includes an outlet duct 7 receiving the air flow from the drum 2 and a control device 11 coupled to the motor 9 and controlling rotation of the drum 9 (Page 3, lines 12 - 17 and Figure 1). The control device 11 performs an anti-crease cycle after the drying phase has been performed, the anti-crease cycle including alternately rotating the drum 2 during rotary movement time intervals and stopping rotation of the drum 2 during stoppage time intervals, the control device 11 decreasing the duration of the rotary movement intervals in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter.

Dependent Claim 36

Claim 36 depends from claim 16 and recites that the method for drying laundry in a dryer according to Claim 16 further comprises performing the drying program again including another heating-up phase, another drying phase, and another cooling-down phase and performing another anti-crease cycle after the another drying phase of the drying program has been performed, this another anti-crease cycle having alternating intervals including rotary movement time intervals, in which the drum is rotated to agitate the laundry, and stoppage time intervals, in which the drum stops rotating and the laundry is at rest, the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreasing in relation to the stoppage time intervals, and the duration of these rotary movement intervals decreasing in relation to these stoppage time intervals in a different manner than the duration of the rotary movement intervals decrease in relation to the stoppage time intervals in connection with the anti-crease cycle of the first-mentioned drying phase (Page 2, lines 7 - 24 and Figure 1).

The References

Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 discloses a clothes dryer 10 including a drum 11 having a bulkhead 12 in which there is an inlet aperture 13 and a drive motor 17 to drive a fan and connected in a driving relationship with the drum 11 (Column 3, lines 55 - 68 and Figure 1). The clothes dryer 10 also includes a digital control circuit 23, a digital

counter circuit 26, a memory 28 and a control logic circuit 27 (Column 4, lines 7 - 14, and Figures 1 and 2). The control logic circuit 27 includes a plurality of outputs for controlling various machine functions and, accordingly, for controlling the program of the dryer (Column 4, lines 16 - 35). Janke '030 discloses a method of controlling a fabric treating apparatus comprising the steps of (a) initiating a fabric treating operation; (b) sensing a parameter related to the condition of the fabric within the treatment zone; (c) counting pulses from a source of timing signals; (d) repeatedly terminating and restarting the count until said sensed parameter reaches a predetermined value; and (e) terminating the fabric treating operation upon the accumulation of a preselected count (Column 5, lines 17 - 46 and Figure 3).

Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 discloses a clothes drying machine having an arrangement shown in Figure 5 by which an operator can manually control a motor reversing switch 60 to manually reverse the direction of a blower 36 between a direction A, in which a higher flow of air is passed over clothes in the dryer and a direction B in which a lower flow of air is passed over the clothes (Column 4, lines 16 - 71, and Figures 4 and 5). Hughes '776 discloses a "de-wrinkle" cycle feature (Column 5, line 63, to Column 6, line 3).

St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764 discloses a clothes dryer 10 (Figure 1) having a control circuit (Abstract).

Liebermann US Patent No. 3,060,591 discloses a dryer control apparatus having a finger 21a that depresses a control bar 34 according to the weight of material placed in a drum 12 (Column 2, lines 18 - 69, and Figures 1 - 5).

Worst US Patent No. 3,309,783 discloses a clothes dryer 1 (Column 2, lines 17 - 26 and Figures 1 - 4) having a drum reversal feature (Column 1, lines 45 - 60).

Kohlman et al US Patent No. 6,381,870 discloses a drying cycle phenomenon wherein a bag into which laundry can be placed and the bag with laundry therein is tumbled in a clothes dryer (Column 4, line 53 - Column 5, line 17 and Figures 2 - 14).

(6) GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

a. Whether claims 16 - 19, 23, and 28 - 31 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776?

b. Whether claims 20 - 21 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764?

c. Whether claim 22 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 in view of Liebermann US Patent No. 3,060,591?

d. Whether claim 24 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 in view of Worst US Patent No. 3,309,783?

e. Whether claims 25 - 27 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776?

f. Whether claims 33 - 36 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 in view of Kohlman et al US Patent No. 6,381,870?

g. Whether claim 36 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 in view of Kohlman et al US Patent No. 6,381,870?

(7) ARGUMENT

A) The Rejection of Claims 16 - 19, 23, and 28 - 31 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in View of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 Is Not Proper

The Examiner asserts that Janke '030 discloses performing an anti-crease cycle that has alternating intervals including rotary movement time intervals, in which the drum is rotated to agitate the laundry, and stoppage time intervals, in which the drum stops rotating and the laundry is at rest, with the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter. According to the Examiner, Janke '030 does not disclose the feature that, after the drying phase has been performed, an anti-crease cycle is introduced. Nonetheless, according to the Examiner, Hughes '776 discloses an anti-crease cycle and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Janke '030 with the anti-crease feature of Hughes '776 for the purpose of optimizing energy by minimizing the amount of energy used in laundry drying by use of an anti-crease feature.

Appellants respectfully submit that neither Janke '030 nor Hughes '776, alone or in combination, teach or disclose the novel features of Appellants' method for drying laundry in a dryer and laundry dryer as recited in independent claim 16 and claims 17 - 19 and 23 depending ultimately therefrom, or teach or disclose the novel features of the Appellants' laundry dryer as recited in independent claim 28 and claims 29 -31 depending ultimately therefrom. It is respectfully submitted that: (a) neither Janke '030 nor Hughes '776 would teach one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Janke '030 with the anti-crease feature of Hughes '776 for the purpose of optimizing energy by minimizing the amount of energy used in laundry drying by use of an anti-crease feature and (b) even if one skilled in the art were to combine the teachings of Janke '030 and Hughes '776, the resulting method would still not include all of the features of the method of the present invention, since neither Janke '030 nor Hughes '776 teach or

disclose an anti-crease feature that is introduced after the drying phase has been performed.

As noted, in the method for drying laundry recited in claim 16 of the present application, an anti-crease cycle has alternating intervals including rotary movement time intervals, in which the drum is rotated to agitate the laundry, and stoppage time intervals, in which the drum stops rotating and the laundry is at rest, whereupon the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter. The Examiner accurately notes that Janke '030 does not disclose the feature that, after the drying phase has been performed, an anti-crease cycle is introduced. However, the Examiner erroneously asserts that Hughes '776 discloses just such a feature by virtue of the fact that Hughes '776 discloses a "de-wrinkle" cycle feature - namely, the disclosure in Column 5, line 63, to Column 6, line 3 of Hughes '776 of a "de-wrinkle" cycle. While it is true that Hughes '776 discloses a "de-wrinkle" cycle, an examination of Hughes '776 reveals that Hughes '776 specifically discloses that such a "de-wrinkle" cycle is one version of the drying phase itself and Hughes '776 does not in any manner hint or suggest, let alone disclose, that its "de-wrinkle" cycle is, in the language of claim 16 of the present application, an anti-crease cycle that is performed after the drying phase has been performed - i.e., a wholly separate cycle separate and apart from the drying phase during which heating-up, drying, and cooling down of clothes has already been performed.

Hughes '776 discloses that the manual control feature of its motor reversing switch 60 permits an operator to provide a greater or lesser heating effect and points out as an example of this that the operator can manually control the motor reversing switch 60 to provide a "low" air flow in the event that the particular clothes to be dried (e.g., wash and wear fabrics) need to be "de-wrinkled" and, therefore, should be subjected to a temperature at a higher level. The manual control of the motor reversing switch 60 is disclosed in Hughes '776 as a feature of an alternative control circuit arrangement (the second control circuit arrangement of Figure 5) that can be selected instead of an automatic timer control feature in which the motor reversing switch 60 is controlled to automatically reverse the direction of rotation of the blower 36 (the first control circuit arrangement of Figure 4). Accordingly, it is absolutely clear that the

disclosure in Column 5, line 63, to Column 6, line 3 of Hughes '776 of a "de-wrinkle" cycle is directed to an alternative control circuit arrangement (the second control circuit arrangement of Figure 5) for performing the drying cycle that would otherwise be performed under the control of the first control circuit arrangement of Figure 4. Hughes '776 in no manner or fashion suggests that an anti-crease cycle is provided above and beyond, or in addition to, the drying cycle that is performed either via the first control circuit arrangement of Figure 4 or via the second control circuit arrangement of Figure 5.

Moreover, even if the combination of Janke '030 and Hughes '776 resulted in a method that includes all of the steps of the method for drying laundry recited in claim 16 of the present application, which Appellants submit is not the case, it is not at all certain that one of skill in the art would be motivated to combine Janke '030 and Hughes '776 by "the purpose of optimizing energy by minimizing the amount of energy used in laundry drying by use of an anti-crease feature" as asserted by the Examiner. In view of the fact that the method for drying laundry recited in claim 16 of the present application recites that an anti-crease cycle is performed in addition to a drying cycle, it is not accurate to assert that such a method for drying laundry minimizes the amount of energy, as such a method entails additional energy loads (for example, energy for drum tumbling, energy for air flow, energy for heating) beyond the energy for a drying cycle. Thus, one skilled in the art seeking to minimize the amount of energy used in laundry drying would not, in contrast to the assertion by the Examiner, be motivated to add an additional energy loading step such as the anti-crease cycle of the method for drying laundry recited in claim 16 of the present application. Accordingly, one skilled in the art seeking to provide an improvement in a method for drying laundry such as recited in claim 16 of the present application would not be motivated to combine Janke '030 and Hughes '776 as asserted by the Examiner.

In view of the absence in either Janke '030 or Hughes '776 of any teaching or disclosure of a method for drying laundry as recited in claim 16 of the present application in which an anti-crease cycle is performed after a drying cycle, it cannot be asserted that either Janke '030 or Hughes '776 alone or in combination renders obvious the present invention under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and the rejection of claim 16, and the rejections of claims 17 - 19, 23 all ultimately depending upon claim 16, should be

withdrawn. For the same reasons, the rejection of independent apparatus claim 28, and claims 29 - 31 all ultimately depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Janke '030 in view of Hughes '776 should be withdrawn.

- B. The Rejection of Claims 20 - 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as Unpatentable Over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in View of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 In View of St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764 Is Not Proper

Claims 20 - 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764. With regard to St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764, the Examiner asserts that this reference discloses a pre-selected drying program selected by the user. While St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764 may disclose such a pre-selected drying program selected by the user, it is not seen, and the Examiner has not alleged, that St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764 teaches or discloses an anti-crease cycle in which the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 20 - 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764 cannot be sustained in view of the failure of Janke '030 and Hughes '776 to teach or disclose the present invention and the failure of St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764 to remedy the deficiencies of Janke '030 and Hughes '776.

- C. The Rejection of Claim 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as Unpatentable Over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in View of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 in View of Liebermann US Patent No. 3,060,591 Is Not Proper

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 in view of

Liebermann US Patent No. 3,060,591. With regard to Liebermann '591, the Examiner asserts that this reference discloses the step of detecting an amount of laundry. While Liebermann '591 may disclose such a pre-selected drying program selected by the user, it is not seen, and the Examiner has not alleged, that Liebermann '591 teaches or discloses an anti-crease cycle in which the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 in view of Liebermann US Patent No. 3,060,591 cannot be sustained in view of the failure of Janke '030 and Hughes '776 to teach or disclose the present invention and the failure of Liebermann US Patent No. 3,060,591 to remedy the deficiencies of Janke '030 and Hughes '776.

- D. The Rejection of Claim 24 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as Unpatentable Over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in View of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 in View of Worst US Patent No. 3,309,783 Is Not Proper

The References

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 in view of Worst US Patent No. 3,309,783. Claim 24 depends from claim 16 and recites further features of the method for drying laundry recited in claim 16 of the present application.

Worst US Patent No. 3,309,783 discloses a clothes dryer 1 (Column 2, lines 17 - 26 and Figures 1 - 4) having a drum reversal feature (Column 1, lines 45 - 60). With regard to Worst US Patent No. 3,309,783, this reference is alleged to disclose a drum reversing feature for a clothes dryer. While that may be so, it is not seen, and the Examiner has not alleged, that Worst US Patent No. 3,309,783 teaches or discloses a method for drying laundry as recited in claim 16 of the present application in which an anti-crease cycle is performed after a drying cycle. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US

Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 in view of Worst US Patent No. 3,309,783 cannot be sustained view of the failure of Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 or Hughes '776 to teach or disclose the method for drying laundry recited in claim 16 of the present application and the failure of Worst US Patent No. 3,309,783 to remedy the deficiencies of Janke '030 or Hughes '776.

E. The Rejection of Claims 25 - 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as Unpatentable Over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in View of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 Is Not Proper

Claims 25 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776. Claims 25 - 27, all ultimately depending upon claim 16, each recite further features of the method for drying laundry recited in claim 16 of the present application.

The Examiner asserts that Janke '030 in view of Hughes '776 discloses the claimed invention, except for the claimed stop time intervals with subsequent magnitudes. However, according to the Examiner, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to recite that feature since the teachings of Janke '030 and Hughes '776 would perform the invention as claimed, regardless of the recited time intervals and magnitude. However, Appellants submit that, in view of the absence in Janke '030 or Hughes '776 of any mention of a method for drying laundry as recited in claim 16 of the present application in which an anti-crease cycle is performed after a drying cycle, it cannot be asserted that Janke '030 in view of Hughes '776 renders obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) the subject matter of claims 25 - 27 of the present application all ultimately depending from claim 16. In view of the absence in Janke '030 or Hughes '776 of any mention of an anti-crease cycle in which the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter, it cannot be asserted that Janke '030 or Hughes '776, alone or in combination, render obvious the subject matter of claims 25 - 27 of the present application under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

- F. The Rejection of Claims 33 - 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as Unpatentable Over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in View of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 in View of Kohlman et al US Patent No. 6,381,870 Is Not Proper

Claims 33 - 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Kohlman et al US Patent No. 6,381,870. The Examiner asserts that Janke '030 in view of Hughes '776 discloses the claimed invention, except for the claimed anti-crease feature. However, according to the Examiner, it would have been an obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Janke '030 in view of Hughes '776 with the anti-crease feature of Kohlman et al '870 in order to allow various operator controls for different laundering requirements. While Kohlman et al US Patent No. 6,381,870 may disclose an anti-crease feature, it is not seen, and the Examiner has not alleged, that Kohlman et al US Patent No. 6,381,870 teaches or discloses an anti-crease cycle in which the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 33 - 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Kohlman et al US Patent No. 6,381,870 cannot be sustained in view of the failure of Janke '030 or Hughes '776 to teach or disclose the present invention and the failure of Kohlman et al US Patent No. 6,381,870 to remedy the deficiencies of Janke '030 or Hughes '776.

- G. The Rejection of Claim 36 As Unpatentable Over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in View of Hughes US Patent No. 2,961,776 in View of Kohlman et al US Patent No. 6,381,870 Is Not Proper

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Kohlman et al US Patent No. 6,381,870. The Examiner asserts that Janke '030 in view of Hughes '776 discloses the claimed invention, except for the claimed anti-crease feature. However, according to the

Examiner, it would have been an obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Janke '030 in view of Hughes '776 with the anti-crease feature of Kohlman et al '870 in order to allow various operator controls for different laundering requirements.

Claim 36 depends from claim 16 and recites that the method for drying laundry in a dryer according to claim 16 further comprises performing the drying program again including another heating-up phase, another drying phase, and another cooling-down phase and performing another anti-crease cycle after the another drying phase of the drying program has been performed. This additional anti-crease cycle has alternating intervals including rotary movement time intervals, in which the drum is rotated to agitate the laundry, and stoppage time intervals, in which the drum stops rotating and the laundry is at rest. Moreover, the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals, and the duration of these rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to these stoppage time intervals in a different manner than the duration of the rotary movement intervals decrease in relation to the stoppage time intervals in connection with the anti-crease cycle of the first-mentioned drying phase.

While Kohlman et al '870 may disclose an anti-crease feature, it is submitted that Kohlman et al '870 does not teach or disclose any anti-crease cycle that comprises alternating intervals including rotary movement time intervals, in which the drum is rotated to agitate the laundry, and stoppage time intervals, in which the drum stops rotating and the laundry is at rest. Moreover, even if Kohlman et al '870 did teach or disclose an anti-crease cycle that comprises alternating intervals in which the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals, which Appellants submit it does not, Kohlman et al '870 does not hint at or suggest that the duration of these rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to these stoppage time intervals in a different manner than the duration of the rotary movement intervals decrease in relation to the stoppage time intervals in connection with the anti-crease cycle of a first- drying phase, as is recited in claim 36 of the present application. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Hughes US

Patent 2,961,776 in view of Kohlman et al US Patent No. 6,381,870 should be withdrawn.

(8) CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing discussion, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the Examiner's rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

/James E. Howard/

James E. Howard
Registration No. 39,715
October 8, 2010

BSH Home Appliances Corporation
100 Bosch Blvd.
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-639-7644
Fax: 714-845-2807
james.howard@bshg.com

CLAIMS APPENDIX

Claims 1 - 15(Canceled)

16. (Rejected) A method for drying laundry in a dryer comprising a housing and a drum receiving the laundry and mounted for rotation with respect to the housing, the method comprising the acts of:
performing a drying program including a heating-up phase, a drying phase, and a cooling-down phase;
performing an anti-crease cycle after the drying phase has been performed, the anti-crease cycle having alternating intervals including rotary movement time intervals, in which the drum is rotated to agitate the laundry, and stoppage time intervals, in which the drum stops rotating and the laundry is at rest, the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreasing in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter.
17. (Rejected) The method according to claim 16, wherein the operating parameter includes the length of time of the anti-crease cycle.
18. (Rejected) The method according to claim 16, further comprising the act of detecting the temperature of the laundry with a sensor and the operating parameter includes a decrease in the temperature of the laundry.
19. (Rejected) The method according to claim 16, further comprising the act of detecting the residual moisture of the laundry with a sensor and the operating parameter includes a decrease in the residual moisture of the laundry.
20. (Rejected) The method according to claim 16, wherein the operating parameter includes the pre-selected drying program selected by the user.

21. (Rejected) The method according to claim 16, further comprising the act of receiving an amount of laundry in the dryer being preset by a user and the operating parameter includes the amount of the laundry.
22. (Rejected) The method according to claim 16, further comprising the act of detecting an amount of laundry in the dryer with a sensor and the operating parameter includes the amount of the laundry.
23. (Rejected) The method according to claim 16, further comprising the act of detecting at least one of a quantity of laundry, a heating-up time, a laundry moisture, a laundry moisture profile, a laundry specific conductance, a profile of the laundry specific conductance, a moisture content and/or the moisture profile, a temperature of the laundry, a temperature profile of the laundry, a temperature of the drying air, a temperature profile of the drying air in the drum of the laundry dryer, a comparison of the moisture content, a moisture profile, a temperature of the drying air, a temperature profile of the drying air in the drum of the laundry dryer between entry into the drum and exit from the drum, and a time before reaching a drying target.
24. (Rejected) The method according to claim 16, wherein the act of performing the anti-crease cycle includes rotating the drum in opposite directions during subsequent rotary movement time intervals.
25. (Rejected) The method according to claim 16, wherein the duration of the anti-crease cycle is between about one and five hours.
26. (Rejected) The method according to claim 16, wherein the act of performing the anti-crease cycle includes four subsequent time intervals starting with a first time interval and ending with a fourth time interval, each time interval including the rotary movement time intervals and stoppage time intervals, the rotary time interval comprising between about 20% and 90% of the first time interval, the

rotary time interval comprising between about 10% and 70% of the second time interval, the rotary time interval comprising between about 1% and 60% of the third time interval, and the rotary time interval comprising between about 1% and 30% of the fourth time interval.

27. (Rejected) The method according to claim 26, wherein the duration of the rotary movement time interval remains substantially the same during each of the four subsequent time intervals and the duration of the stoppage time interval during the fourth time interval is greater than the duration of the stoppage time interval during the first time interval.
28. (Rejected) A laundry dryer comprising;
a housing;
a drum receiving the laundry and mounted for rotation with respect to the housing;
a motor coupled to the drum for driving rotation of the drum;
an inlet duct providing an air flow to the drum and a heating device selectively heating air in the inlet duct;
an outlet duct receiving the air flow from the drum;
a control device coupled to the motor and controlling rotation of the drum, the control device performing an anti-crease cycle after the drying phase has been performed, the anti-crease cycle including alternately rotating the drum during rotary movement time intervals and stopping rotation of the drum during stoppage time intervals, the control device decreasing the duration of the rotary movement intervals in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter.
29. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 28, further comprising a timing element providing a length of time of the anti-crease cycle to the control device and the operating parameter including an increase in the length of time of the anti-crease cycle.

- 30. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 28, further comprising a temperature sensor detecting the temperature of the laundry and providing a temperature signal to the control device indicating the temperature of the laundry, the operating parameter including the temperature signal.
- 31. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 28, further comprising a electrodes detecting a moisture level of the laundry and providing a moisture signal to the control device indicating the moisture level of the laundry, the operating parameter including the moisture signal.
- 32. (Cancelled)
- 33. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 28, wherein the control device performs a drying cycle in the form of an anti-crease cycle that includes alternatingly rotating the drum during rotary movement time intervals and stopping rotation of the drum during stoppage time intervals, the control device decreasing the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreasing in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter.
- 34. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 33, further comprising a timing element providing a length of time of the anti-crease cycle to the control device and the operating parameter including an increase in the length of time of the anti-crease cycle.
- 35. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 33, further comprising a temperature sensor detecting the temperature of the laundry and providing a temperature signal to the control device indicating the temperature of the laundry, the operating parameter including the temperature signal.

36. (Rejected) The method according to claim 16 and further comprising performing the drying program again including another heating-up phase, another drying phase, and another cooling-down phase and performing another anti-crease cycle after the another drying phase of the drying program has been performed, this another anti-crease cycle having alternating intervals including rotary movement time intervals, in which the drum is rotated to agitate the laundry, and stoppage time intervals, in which the drum stops rotating and the laundry is at rest, the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreasing in relation to the stoppage time intervals, and the duration of these rotary movement intervals decreasing in relation to these stoppage time intervals in a different manner than the duration of the rotary movement intervals decrease in relation to the stoppage time intervals in connection with the anti-crease cycle of the first-mentioned drying phase.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None